



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,158	02/27/2002	Paul Beck	272/012	2670
34261	7590	02/20/2009		
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP 633 WEST FIFTH STREET, TWENTY-FIRST FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2040			EXAMINER	
			HSIAO, JAMES K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3657	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/086,158	BECK, PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES K. HSIAO	3657	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/30/2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/27/2002

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Each independent claim recites the limitation "an inelastic reinforcing ribbon of a flexible tear-resistant material," it is unclear because it is not understood how a material can be flexible and inelastic. It is assumed that if a material is flexible, then it has some degree of elasticity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 18-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marty et al. (US-2985222).

Regarding claims 18-21, Marty discloses an outer length of flexible tear-resistant material (fig 1) having mating extended ends (figs –9) so as to form a closed loop and defining an endless channel (6) extending longitudinally therethrough (fig 4), an inelastic reinforcing enforcing ribbon (8) of a flexible tear-resistant material (col. 3, lines 24-28) disposed within said channel (figure 2), said ribbon defining first and second ends and

extending across said mating ends of said outer length of material and twice about said loop defined by said outer length of material so as to define two layers of reinforcing ribbon within said outer length of material (col. 4, lines 9-21), said first end of said ribbon being disposed adjacent to said second end thereof, said adhesive being disposed about said layers of ribbon (col. 3, lines 14-25) and securing together said layers of ribbon and securing said ribbon to said outer length of material to maintain said outer length of material in said closed loop (col. 3, lines 14-25). And regarding claim 20, Marty discloses a slit extending the length thereof from said outer surface to said channel. Examiner interprets the slit in such a way that the channel (6) of Marty is also a slit, namely the space above (3) in figure 2 and below the top surface of (4').

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1- 17 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marty et al. (US-2985222) in view of Takashima (US-4655732).

Regarding claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 13, 17, 22, 23, 24, Marty et al. discloses an outer length of flexible tear-resistant material (fig 1) having mating extended ends (figs –9) so as to form a closed loop and defining an endless channel (6) extending longitudinally therethrough (fig 4), an inelastic reinforcing enforcing ribbon (8) of a flexible tear-

resistant material (col. 3, lines 24-28) disposed within said channel (figure 2), said ribbon defining first and second ends and extending across said mating ends of said outer length of material and twice about said loop defined by said outer length of material so as to define two layers of reinforcing ribbon within said outer length of material (col. 4, lines 9-21), said first end of said ribbon being disposed adjacent to said second end thereof, said adhesive being disposed about said layers of ribbon (col. 3, lines 14-25) and securing together said layers of ribbon and securing said ribbon to said outer length of material to maintain said outer length of material in said closed loop (col. 3, lines 14-25). And regarding claim 13, Marty discloses a slit extending the length thereof from said outer surface to said channel. Examiner interprets the slit in such a way that the channel (6) of Marty is also a slit, namely the space above (3) in figure 2 and below the top surface of (4').

Marty et al. lacks wherein the adhesive is injected. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Takashima teaches wherein an adhesive is injected into the belt to keep a reinforcing member adhered to a belt (col. 8, lines 60-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to inject the adhesive in the channel to adhere the belt to the reinforcing ribbon because when injecting, a boundary surface between the resin and the belt can be made rugged to increase the adhesive strength (col. 8, lines 60-65).

Regarding claim 2, Marty discloses wherein the ribbon is of a braided construction and cooperates with its adhesive (col. 3, lines 20-23).

Regarding claims 3, 7, 12, 15 and 16, Marty discloses wherein the ribbon can be made from two different materials (col. 3, line 26).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, it is merely a design choice as to what strength of adhesive is selected and would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to select an adhesive of necessary strength.

Regarding claim 10, marty et al. discloses wherein the mating ends of said outer length of flexible tear-resistant material define a first location (5) on said closed loop and said first end portion of said reinforcing ribbon overlaps (col. 4, lines 9-21) said second end portion thereof along a second location on said closed loop, said first location being substantially diametrically opposed across said loop from said second location (col. 4, lines 9-21).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Beck, Schanin, and Akita were used during examination but were not relied upon for rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES K. HSIAO whose telephone number is (571)272-6259. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Siconolfi can be reached on 571-272-7124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JKH

/Robert A. Siconolfi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3657